

Applicants respectfully traverse the restriction requirement with respect to inventions to Groups II and III. Restriction is proper only if the inventions are distinct. The restriction requirement states that the inventions are distinct because the product can be made by a materially different process. The Examiner states that "instead of applying a slurry to the ceramic body, a separate thin film . . . can be formed on a release layer and laminated onto the ceramic body."

Applicants respectfully submit that the alternative method given by the Examiner in the restriction requirement would not necessarily lead to the same structure produced by the method of Group II, claims 7-14. For example, the claimed method recites the step of "impregnating the slurry into the pores of the ceramic body" (claim 9). Applicants respectfully submit that the alternative method would not necessarily impregnate the slurry into the pores of the ceramic body. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the restriction requirement be withdrawn, and Groups II and III examined together.

CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above, early and favorable consideration is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned if that would be helpful to resolving any issue.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/10/92

By: Mark A. Frentrup
Mark A. Frentrup
Reg. No. 41,026

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

MAF:bd